

REMARKS

In response to the office action mailed October 13, 2006, Applicants amended claims 1 and 10, cancelled claims 18 and 21-31, and added new claims 33-43. Claims 8, 9, and 14 were previously cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-7, 10-13, 15-17, 19, 20, and 32-43 are presented for examination.

Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention. In particular, the Examiner noted that claim 10 was indefinite because it depended from cancelled claim 9. Applicants amended claim 10 to depend from claim 1, and therefore request that the rejection of claims 10 and 11 be withdrawn.

The Examiner also noted that claim 13 was rejected for depending from a claim rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. However, claim 13 was dependent on claim 12, which depended from claim 1. Neither claim 12 nor claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants believe that the Examiner intended to refer to claim 11 as the rejected claim, rather than claim 13. In any event, Applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner indicated that claims 12, 13, 18, and 32 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner also indicated that claims 10 and 11 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the above-mentioned rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 1, as amended, includes the limitations of claim 18, as previously presented, as well as all of the limitations of the base claim (i.e., the previous version of claim 1) and any intervening claims. Claims 2-7, 10-13, and 15-17, 19, and 20 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 1-7, 10-13, and 15-17, 19, and 20 are allowable.

Newly added claim 33 includes the limitations of claim 10, as previously presented, as well as all of the limitations of the base claim (i.e., the previous version of claim 1) and any

Applicant : William H. Shepard et al.
Serial No. : 10/662,266
Filed : September 15, 2003
Page : 8 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 05918-212001 / 4470

intervening claims. Claim 34 depends from claim 33. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 33 and 34 are allowable.


Newly added claim 35 includes the limitations of claim 12, as previously presented, as well as all of the limitations of the base claim (i.e., the previous version of claim 1) and any intervening claims. Claims 36-43 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 35. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 36-43 are allowable, which action is requested.

In view of the foregoing discussion, Applicants request that all of the pending claims be allowed.

Enclosed is a \$1100.00 check for excess claim fees. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 30, 2006



Michael R. Hamlin
Reg. No. 54,149

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906